

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group
Management Council

October 21, 1998
EESB Snoqualmie Room
8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

PURPOSE

- To review lessons learned in C-Reactor procurements
- To learn about the EM R&D Program Plan

AGENDA

UPDATES

Andros Robot Deployment -- The Andros robot developed by PNNL was deployed in the rail tunnel at the 221-U facility to get visual and photo records and to take samples. The same robot will be taken into the ventilation tunnel of the canyon this year.

Spectrum '98 -- There was heavy emphasis on D&D at the Spectrum conference in Denver. Hanford had a booth to showcase the C-Reactor and Canyon Disposition Initiative projects.

S&T Needs Process -- This year the needs statements will be published on a CD. The S&T Needs Process Improvement Committee met twice and made several recommendations to the Management Council.

Subgroup Oral Reports -- Each Subgroup gave a short report on recent activities. All Subgroups are working on their FY 1998 Annual Reports and FY 1999 Work Plans.

WORKING GROUP ON REVITALIZATION OF THE STCG

John Neath reported on the revitalization of the STCG. The working group concluded that the scope of work for the STCG is valid, but it may need to be more focused. The 63 comments were organized into three main categories: Communications, Subgroup Interactions, and Management Council Operations.

D&D PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND LESSONS LEARNED FOR C-REACTOR

Jim Goodenough, DOE-RL, and Dennis Houston, Manager of Procurement for BHI, presented the procurement strategy used for C-Reactor. They took advantage of the 1998 FARs and assigned procurement people to the project so they could work closely with the users.

ENDORSEMENT OF S&T WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS -- VOTE

There was discussion regarding endorsement of the S&T Workshop Recommendations. It was decided to reword our letter to include clarification of our endorsement of the recommendation that each site should consider the possibility of fee-earning potential. With that modification, the vote passed unanimously.

EM R&D PROGRAM PLAN

Loni Peurrung presented information on the EM R&D Program Plan, which is a roadmapping effort within DOE. It is anticipated that high-risk projects that have a high level of investment will have to prepare a roadmap. It will be used as an opportunity to align the S&T program with the needs of the customer.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Bob Rosselli – “AM of the Month”
- Progress in meeting our S&T Needs
- Status report on S&T Needs Process Improvements
- Status report on ITRD Project
- Develop FY99 Work Plan for the Management Council
- C-Reactor Success Story
- FDH presentation on FY99 Technology Deployments / How to team with Procurement
- STCG Image
- Update on HTI

MEETING REVIEW/WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be November 18, 1998 in the EESB Snoqualmie Room, 8:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon.

ACTION ITEMS

- Phone call to HQ and Focus Areas about ASTD funding for this fiscal year
ACTION: John Murphy/John Neath
- Letter to MWFA on Hanford needs and their lack of response
ACTION: Ellen Dagan
- Modify transmittal letter for endorsement of S&T Workshop recommendations regarding incentives for contractors
ACTION: John Neath

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

October 21, 1998
EESB Snoqualmie Room
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was opened and introductions were made around the room. John Neath introduced John LaRocque, a visitor from the State of Washington Department of Commerce, Trade, and Economic Development.

UPDATES

Andros Robot Deployment

Kim Koegler reported on the deployment of the Andros robot and showed a four-minute video. BHI is working toward a record of decision on U-Plant. The initial characterization activity involved the deployment of PNNL's Andros robot in the 221-U facility's rail tunnel, which had not been accessed in about 25 years. The purpose of that deployment was to get visual and photo records and to take samples. The robot, which can handle a 50-pound payload on extended arms, took numerous smear samples. The same robot will be taken over 800 ft through a chimney into the ventilation tunnel of the canyon this year, once funding is available.

Spectrum '98

Jim Goodenough reported on this year's Spectrum conference, sponsored by ANS, which was held in Denver. There was heavy emphasis on D&D. There were five D&D participants from Hanford. They were asked by the D&D Focus Area to have a booth to showcase the C-Reactor and Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI) projects. All the large-scale demonstrations had booths. The Russian delegation was there, and they met with them to see if there could be collaboration on the CDI. The Hanford D&D participants had a review when they got back to see what might be used from the conference from a strategic planning perspective.

S&T Needs Process

Dennis Brown gave an update on the S&T Needs Process Improvement Committee. This year the needs statements will be published on a CD. Next year's improvements will include adding pictures and endorsements, as well as making a video. The committee has met twice. Their recommendations include:

- Make the committee a standing committee that meets as necessary.
- Define the scope of the S&T needs tracking database system (report back to committee by October 30).

- Draft a letter from John Wagoner to the AMs and the contractors with the schedule for the FY 2000 S&T Needs process for committee review (by October 30).
- Get technology presentations and issues on the Site Management Board (SMB) agenda as necessary.
- Produce the FY 1999 S&T needs CD.
- Produce an improved CD in FY 2000.

There was a question about the flexibility of making additions or changes to the needs at any time. They are trying to make the process a living/continuous process. New S&T needs could be added onto the CD at any time, but they would only be endorsed once a year.

Subgroup Oral Reports

Tanks Subgroup

Cathie Louie reported that their last meeting focused on reviewing the tank S&T needs again and resolution of comments received. They are trying to interact with the ad-hoc committee on improving the process.

A question was raised about whether or not the Tanks needs went out to the Management Council without Subgroup approval. The presentation was made to the Management Council pending Subgroup comments being resolved. Not all comments were resolved before the document went out. They had quite a discussion on whether or not to hold up the document, but decided to send it out. They are still pursuing getting the comments resolved.

Subsurface Contaminant Subgroup

Fred Serier reported that there has been no word from SCFA on funding for the ASTD proposals. The In Situ Redox Manipulation (ISRM) and Innovative Treatment Remediation Demonstration (ITRD) projects are in progress and will provide status reports to Management Council in a couple of months. We hope to get an ITRD project for the 200-Area carbon tetrachloride plume kicked off in January.

The Subcon Subgroup put together their draft FY 1998 Annual Report and their draft FY 1999 Work Plan. The Annual Report should be ready for distribution at the next meeting, and the Work Plan will be on the December meeting agenda.

There was a question about funding for ISRM and burial ground characterization. Are these projects on hold until we get ASTD funds? We are not on hold for ISRM, and we anticipate that we are going to get those funds. EM-40 is pursuing the projects and needs matching funds to complete. It might be appropriate for the Management Council to send a letter to HQ after getting current information from the SCFA meeting in Augusta. John Murphy and John Neath took the action to find out what's happening with the ASTD funding.

Mixed Waste Subgroup

John Neath reported that the Mixed Waste Subgroup reviewed their S&T needs status. They discussed comments developed on the MWFA Program Plan, scope of work, and funding priority for this year. He raised a flag to expect this Subgroup to identify some action for the Management Council to get the MWFA's attention to our Site's needs. The Subgroup is frustrated with the Focus Area because they are not really addressing our needs. John said that the MWFA is duplicating work that has already been done, and spending too much on management costs (40% of the total). They are focused mainly on mercury, which is a problem for Idaho and Savannah River. It's hard to see any benefits to Hanford.

It was noted that all of the Focus Areas have high administrative costs, and it was suggested that perhaps the Management Council should send a letter to Gerald Boyd about all of them. Cathy Louie said that EM-50 has broken itself into many pieces, and there is a core cost to integrate all these pieces. John Murphy said that we should not get caught up with percentages; we need to look at dollar amounts.

Cathy Louie said that the TFA uses criteria to prioritize activities nationwide. All sites agree that the criteria make sense. They come up with a list as a team. Equity between sites is not a criterion. We might want to look at what the MWFA uses to prioritize funding. Bill Bonner said that there has been a lot more communication of Hanford needs to the MWFA lately, and he sees some impact. We need to continue the communication. Gerald is looking for multi-site demonstrations. The Subgroup should discuss this possibility. Maybe we need to show where we can deploy a technology or get participation at multiple sites

D&D Subgroup

Deanna Klages from DynCorp gave information about the guzzler vacuum system. Its primary purpose is to clean up soil sites and to expose underground utilities. We currently have one on site, but there is a need for three systems. Two could be outfitted to work in contaminated areas.

The D&D Subgroup is also working the FY 1998 Annual Report and the FY 1999 Work Plan. The Subgroup has been briefed and endorses a 140-hour D&D certification program at WSU.

WORKING GROUP ON REVITALIZATION OF THE STCG

John Neath reported on the revitalization of the STCG. The working group consisted of Dave Biancosino, Terry Walton, Jerry White, John Neath, Rick Brouns, Linda Fassbender, and Steve Weakley. The group concluded that the scope of work for the STCG is valid, but we may need to focus more. We need to pick a few items that we can accomplish for the year.

Three main themes came out of the list of 63 comments:

- Communications
- Subgroup interactions
- Management Council operations

The STCG Management Council is the S&T advocate for Hanford. We need to spend more time being that advocate. We need to understand the Site needs and be the advocate for getting those needs addressed by EM or any other technology provider.

Communications:

- Internal – Take actions and follow up
- External – Publicize success outside and bring outside information in

We need to examine the issues and articulate the different perspectives.

Subgroup Interactions:

- Direction – Subgroups want more direction; provide expectations and hold Subgroups accountable
- Actions – Follow up with Focus Areas; be technology advocates; drive the STCG Management Council agenda

The scope of work we have chosen to address is pretty broad. A lot of the information can be provided by e-mail. Management Council members should do their homework prior to the meetings. We only want to be here if we can be effective.

How do we do our job?

- Be part of the solution with consistent participation; be technology advocates, not barriers
- Focus, follow through, and take action
- Use the Subgroups more effectively

Comments/questions:

John Murphy suggested that the Management Council have the same kinds of goals as recommended for the Subgroups. We should make someone responsible for each action and ask him or her to report back to the group the next month on the status of the action.

Fred Serier suggested that the Management Council have a work plan based on input from the Subgroups.

Jim Goodenough agrees with the observations and objectives on communications. The C-Reactor project actually wrote a communications plan. They kept asking the D&D Focus Area for guidance on what amount of communications was the right amount.

Nancy Uziemblo asked if we are effective as a group. She wants to know why we are here and who has the action items. She would like to see us identify what our purpose is. Is it worth meeting once a month? Do we need a clearer list of what we want to accomplish? The Deployment Plan strategy should be part of the Management Council. Our expertise needs to be focused.

Roger Collis suggested that Lloyd and Dave need to take the lead to focus the group, personalize STCG plans for the future, and tell the Management Council what they need to do to be effective.

Dave Langstaff said we should know what direction we are going for each meeting. Goals would certainly help clarify our direction. When you have accomplishments, make sure people know where they fit in your goals. Incorporate elements in the meeting that will provide a structure to maintain focus.

Linda Fassbender suggested that we might want to resurrect the old STCG annual calendar of events for use at the meetings.

Jim Goodenough suggested that perhaps we're becoming too compatible with each other. Maybe we need to stir up the membership. One of the strengths of the STCG is the people who come here to represent key stakeholders. Hopefully they take information back to their organizations.

Fred Serier would like the Management Council to take an action to find out if our ASTD proposals are going to be funded. John Murphy volunteered to make a phone call, and John Neath wanted to participate. The results will be reported back to the Management Council next month.

Dennis Brown commented that this STCG makes an impact on the Focus Areas. We have a lot of power to endorse technologies, etc., but we have to take action to use it.

D&D PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND LESSONS LEARNED FOR C-REACTOR

Jim Goodenough provided an introduction to this presentation. The hypothesis that they had heard is that procurement is a roadblock to successful technology deployment at Hanford.

The process that allowed the C-Reactor project to deploy 21 technologies in 21 months included:

- Needs Identification & Performance Criteria
- Market Survey
- Technology Recommendations
- Requirements Analysis
- Procurement Process
- Perform Demonstrations
- Deployment

Jim introduced Dennis Houston, Manager of Procurement for BHI, who gave a presentation on the procurement strategy used for C-Reactor.

The process they used was the same process they would follow in any Bechtel job. They took advantage of the 1998 Federal Acquisition Regulations (FARs). They assigned procurement people to the project so that they worked directly with the users. Their primary dedication was to

the project. They structure the contract with success in mind - they expect that the technology demonstration and deployment will succeed.

The new procurement rules only made it easier:

- The integrated team approach
- Performance requirements -- not specifics
- Full understanding of the seller's situation
- Adaptations for our application
- The plans made for deployment

FAR Part 12 requires prime contractors and subcontractors at all tiers to incorporate commercial items to the maximum extent practicable. With the new FAR Part 10 in place, they no longer have to go through detailed cost pricing.

The Combined Concept Approach is summarized below:

- FAR revisions allowed them to access the market and tailor their approach.
- Project management principles call for team-oriented involvement early in the process.
- Reassess and revise as necessary.

Questions/Comments:

John Murphy asked what the problems were with technology development and how they eliminated them. Dennis said that late involvement is a major problem. In many organizations, the culture is to "throw things over the fence." You need early involvement and open and frequent communications. They are involved from the development of the specifications through technology deployment.

ENDORSEMENT OF S&T WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS -- VOTE

John Neath restated that the S&T Workshop was a group of people from four different sites: Hanford, Savannah River, Oak Ridge, and Idaho. They assessed the operations of the EM-50 Program and how they worked with the users at each site. This group's endorsement of the S&T Workshop recommendations adds the weight of the STCG and will go directly to Gerald Boyd.

Lloyd Piper commented that the recommendations were sound and he is in favor of endorsement.

Nancy Uziemblo stated that the recommendations should be from the end-user perspective. She indicated that the regulators were not part of the workshop. She has a problem with the recommendation that each site should consider the possibility of fee-earning potential. Are the contractors waiting to do good work until they get the incentive? She can't endorse that kind of philosophy.

Lloyd responded that RL now has performance-based contracting. Currently with BHI and FDH, the entire fee is performance-based. What this recommendation is trying to say is that it's OK to

set objectives for contractors to earn fee during the year. We expect good performance from the contractor, but this is one way to focus their attention on an important aspect of the job.

Kim Koegler asked what the purpose of the statement was. It could be to provide incentive to take a greater risk on a technology they might not otherwise consider. Nancy recommended that that item be rewritten. Rick Brouns asked why none of the deployments happened at Hanford last year; many were at Oak Ridge. He suspected it is in the incentive structure for the contractor. He suggested wording to give them incentive to take more risk. Dave Langstaff also shares the Nancy's view, but feels that this one issue should not make us reject these recommendations.

Lloyd reminded the group that we can't change the report. We might want to add something to our endorsement letter. Contractors have the fundamental obligation to seek out and deploy new technologies. In some instances, some sort of fee incentive program might be useful to accomplish this.

Gordon Rogers also suggested that the first paragraph of the letter be modified to contain more than just one very long sentence.

The vote was unanimous to endorse the S&T Workshop recommendations letter with the suggested modifications.

EM R&D PROGRAM PLAN

Loni Peurrung presented information on the EM R&D Program Plan, which is a roadmapping effort within DOE that provides future thinking about S&T that will be needed to remain competitive.

According to Robert Galvin of Motorola, a "roadmap" is an extended look at the future of a chosen field of inquiry composed from the collective knowledge and imagination of the brightest drivers of change in that field.

Undersecretary Moniz is looking for a framework for DOE's diverse R&D program and an enduring mission for DOE's national laboratories. All of DOE is working on it, not just EM-50. Within EM-50, Gerald Boyd has been given the responsibility for the R&D Program Plan. It describes EM's missions, the role of S&T, and their problem areas (e.g., high-level waste, spent nuclear fuel). The high-level document is the R&D Program Plan; the medium-level roadmap is the MYPP; and the project-level roadmap is the project manager's determination of the S&T investments needed. It is anticipated that high-risk projects that cost a lot and have a high level of investment will have to prepare a roadmap. It will be used as an opportunity to align the S&T program with the needs of the customer.

Questions:

Cathy Louie stated that the single-shell tank roadmap cost \$1M to produce, and she doesn't believe the document was ever looked at after it was published. Isn't this just a summary of where we were going anyway? Loni said that the roadmaps should build on our Technology Insertion Points (TIPs) very well. We can take the process we have and modify it a little, then it's "roadmapping."

Pam Brown said that the goal is good, but it seems to be repackaging what we already do at the Site. The failure might be integration with all sites. Loni said that on the high-level document, we might be able to say that we have these things in place. The MYPPs are pretty much done already at the Focus Areas. The information just needs to be rolled up so it's not so big. At the lower level, it can be used as a tool to get the S&T program looking at the projects.

Roger Collis suggested that some integration could be done at this Site to avoid parallel processes. Could they be all folded together? Loni said that the ultimate goal is to make sure that the S&T program is meeting the needs of the line programs.

Lloyd added that the key objective is the notion that we can tell the outside world that we are doing to do right things. Gerald Boyd appointed a steering committee to help him think through some roadmapping strategies.

Loni has worked with the team. The main point of contact at Hanford is be Rod Quinn, and Kelly Templeton is helping in Loni's absence. She will be figuring out how this will be implemented and getting the guidance out.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Three new items were suggested:

Dave Langstaff: Invite FDH to share with us how they envision their FY99 successes in bringing new technologies on site. How are they going to team with procurement to make that happen?

Nancy Uziemblo is concerned about the STCG image. Pam Brown said that the HAB has an item on the agenda to discuss what is happening in the STCG. Perhaps we could provide the S&T Update Newsletter to the HAB each month.

Cathy Louie: HTI Update (20 minutes)

Those three items were added to the following list of future agenda items:

- Bob Rosselli – "AM of the Month"
- Progress in meeting our S&T needs
- Status report on S&T Needs Process Improvement Committee

- Status report on ITRD Project
- Develop FY99 Work Plan for the Management Council
- C-Reactor Success Story

MEETING REVIEW/WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be November 18, 1998 in the EESB Snoqualmie Room, 8:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon.

ACTION ITEMS

- Phone call to HQ and Focus Areas about ASTD funding for this fiscal year
ACTION: John Murphy/John Neath
- Letter to MWFA on Hanford needs and their lack of response
ACTION: Ellen Dagan
- Modify transmittal letter for endorsement of S&T Workshop recommendations regarding incentives for contractors
ACTION: John Neath